

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of April 19, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and this paper is Applicant's response thereto. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 12-15 and 17-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 7, 12-15 and 17-22, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0114796 to Blast ("Blast") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,702 to Tachibana *et al.* ("Tachibana"). Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over as being unpatentable over Blast in view of Tachibana in view U.S. Patent No. 7,064,858. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over as being unpatentable over Blast in view of Tachibana and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,139,983 to Kelt ("Kelt"). In response, respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 12-15 and 17-25 were rejected in view of Blast and Tachibana or in further view of additional references. Thus the rejection of all claims depends on the combination of Blast and Tachibana.

As an initial matter, Applicant respectfully submits that the reasoning provided in the Office Action to support combination of the Blast and Tachibana references does not make sense. The Office Action suggests that it would have been obvious to combine Tachibana "in order to provide user with a more efficient display system. (see Tachibana, Column 1, lines 50-60)." This portion of Tachibana, however, teaches that its disclosure helps improve the efficiency of character input:

50
The above problems can be summarized as follows.

In a conventional portable information device, every time
enlargement display is to be performed, the user must set an
enlargement display area with a pointing device or the like.
For this purpose, the user must temporarily stop the char-
acter input operation he or she is doing, resulting in a great
deterioration in processing efficiency. 55

In addition, when the input position of a character deviates from a set enlargement display area, the user must set a new enlargement display area, resulting in poor operabil- 60
ity.

Tachibana, Col. 1, L. 50-60. Therefore, the issues addressed by Tachibana would not help display a received message and certainly does nothing to provide a more efficient display system on a mobile phone. Instead, Tachibana teaches to keep the enlarged display window 38 centered around the caret in the active window 37 so that the user can readily continue to input characters, even if the active window is switched. See Tachibana, Col. 8, L. 50-67. However, in a received message, the concept of a caret does not make sense. Therefore, there is no disclosure in Tachibana that explains how one might go about using the disclosure of Tachibana with a message received in a mobile phone such as disclosed in Blast. In other words, the rationale used by the Office Action does not support combining Blast and Tachibana together. Therefore, the §103 rejection made by the Office Action fails to meet the recently noted requirement that an obviousness rejection must include some articulated reasoning that makes logical sense. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007) (“To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. See *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (C.A.Fed.2006) (“[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness”).”). Applicant notes that this problem with the rejection applies to all the pending claims.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites the feature “wherein the user display screen manager is adapted to sequentially display portions of the part of the received display indicia visually displayed in the first screen portion of the display in the second screen portion of the display.” The Office Action points to the follow portion of Tachibana as disclosing this feature that is admittedly missing from Blast:

The enlargement display window 38 is used to enlarge/ 45 display an image in a predetermined range (enlargement display area) including the caret 39 in the active window 37. In this case, as shown in FIG. 2, the caret 39 is preferably set to be always positioned in the center of the enlargement display area. 50

Note that even while the caret 39 is moving in the active window 37 in a continuous character input operation, an image in a predetermined range including the caret 39 is always enlarged/displayed in the enlargement display window 38. The user can therefore input characters while 55 checking the enlarged image of each character which the user is inputting.

FIG. 3 is a block diagram for explaining the main function of the portable information device according to this embodiment. 60

Tachibana, Col. 5, L. 45-60. As can be readily appreciated, Tachibana fails to even contemplate sequentially displaying portions of the part of the received display indicia visually displayed in the first screen portion of the display in the second screen portion of the display. Instead, Tachibana merely discloses allowing the user to view the characters that the user is inputting in an enlarged manner. Furthermore, the indicia in the first screen portion are already displayed in order for the sequentially display in the second screen portion to take place, something not disclosed in the system of Tachibana because in Tachibana the characters are first entered into the enlarged display window. In addition, as noted above, without a caret in the message, the system of Tachibana would not work.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons the combination of Blast and Tachibana fails to disclose all the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the references of record.

Claims 2-4, 7 and 12-15 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over the references of record for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 17 recites the features of “displaying the first part of the display indicia at the first screen portion of the display screen, such that when displayed thereat, the first part of the display indicia is of a first size” and further recites the feature “displaying the first portion of the first part of the display indicia at the second screen portion of the display screen, such that, when displayed thereat, the first portion of the display indicia is of a second size larger than the first size” and further recites the feature “selecting a second portion of the first part of the display

indicia to be displayed in the second screen portion.” As can be readily appreciated, this method requires that first part be displayed before both the first and the second portion of the first part can be displayed. Tachibana fails to disclose taking such steps but instead merely allows the user to view the character the individual is inputting in the enlarged field at the same time that it appears in the active window. In other words, the character is not present in the active window 37 before it is present in the enlarged display window 38. Accordingly, Tachibana fails to disclose all the features of claim 17 that were admitted not disclosed by Blast. Accordingly, the combination of Blast and Tachibana fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable over the references of record.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17 and are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 17 is patentable and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 21 recites the feature “sequentially displaying in a second screen area of the display the plurality of characters of the text message in the first part, the characters being displayed at a second size that is larger than the first size.” The Office Action points to Figure 6, item 38 as well as the description in Col 5, L. 30-60. However, Tachibana merely discloses displaying the input of the user in display window 38 and completely fails to disclose sequentially displaying characters in the first part because the characters being displayed in the display window 38 did not previously exist in the active window. Therefore, as references of record fail to disclose all the steps of claim 21, the references of record fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 21 and claim 21 is patentable.

Claims 22-25 depend from claim 21 are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 21 is patentable and for the additional reasons recited therein.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

As all rejections have been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 21, 2007

By: /Stephen L. Sheldon/
Stephen L. Sheldon
Registration No. 58,732

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001